

Disclaimer:

This document was not produced by DEQ. Some of its content may not be in an accessible format pursuant to Section 508 of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794 (d)). Please call 800-592-5482 if you need assistance.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STATE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN RE: BOARD MEETING

HEARD BEFORE: RICHARD D. LANGFORD

CHAIR OF THE STATE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

JANUARY 8, 2019

CONFERENCE CENTER

DOUBLETREE BY HILTON, RICHMOND

1021 KROGER CENTER BLVD

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

10:43 A.M.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTERS, LLC P. O. Box 13227 Richmond, Virginia 23225 Tel. 804-859-2051 Fax 804-291-9460

```
APPEARANCES:
 1
         Richard D. Langford, Presiding
Chair, State Air Pollution Control Board
 2
 3
         Matthew Gooch, Esq.
Office of the Attorney General
Board Counsel
 4
 5
 6
 7
    STATE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD MEMBERS:
         Nicole M. Rovner
 8
 9
          William H. Ferguson
10
          Ignacia S. Moreno
11
12
    DEQ STAFF:
          David Paylor, DEQ Director
13
          Cindy Berndt
14
15
          Michael Dowd
          Debra Harris
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1		
1	AGENDA	
2	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
3	BCS Draft Permit Background	12
4	Protection of Public Health & Environment is DEQ's most Important Goal	13
5	DEQ S MOSC IMPORCANC GOAL	
6	Proposed BCS Permit Requirements	13
7	Air Modeling	14
8	Public Comment	15
9	Board Meetings	15
10	Staff Recommendations	20
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

(The State Air Pollution Control Board 1 meeting commenced at 10:43 a.m. A quorum was present 2 3 and the taking of testimony commenced as follows:) 4 5 MR. LANGFORD: Good morning. I'm calling this meeting of the State Air 6 Pollution Control Board to order. Before we 7 begin, I'd like to ask everybody to silence 8 9 your phones -- I haven't done it, either. Now I'd like the Board members sitting on 10 the stage to introduce themselves, beginning 11 on my right. 12 13 MS. ROVNER: 14 I'm Nikki Rovner, and 15 I live in the City of Richmond. 16 MR. FERGUSON: Good morning. 17 name is William H. Ferguson and I am from 18 19 Tidewater Virginia. 20 MS. MORENO: I skipped you, sorry. 21 22 MR. LANGFORD: That's all right. 23 I'm Richard Langford, the Chair of the 24 25 Board. And I'm from Blacksburg.

MS. MORENO: I'm Ignacia Moreno and I'm from McLean, Virginia.

MR. LANGFORD: Thank you. We do now have a quorum. There are three members of the Board not joining us today.

Mr. Hoagland had -- who has a conflict of interest in the action before the Board.

And two newly sworn in members of the Board, Ms. Kapur and Ms. Bush. Also on stage today is David Paylor, Director of Environmental Quality and the Board's legal counsel, Matthew Gooch, Assistant Attorney General.

The only item on today's agenda is the minor new source review permit for Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC, Buckingham Compressor Station, registration number 21599.

Before we begin, I'd like to remind everyone that at the Board's meeting on November 8 through 9, the Board received detailed presentations from DEQ staff on the development and technical aspects of a draft permit. The public comments that were

received during the public comment period that ran from August 8th to September 21, the agency's response to those comments and staff amendments to the draft minor new source review permit.

In addition, the Board heard comments directly from 80 members of the public who had previously commented. And they -- and also a brief presentation from the applicant.

After the presentations and public comment, the Board discussed the draft permit and asked numerous questions of staff but deferred any action on the draft permit until a meeting on December 9th -- 19th of 2018.

At the December meeting, the Board received the presentations from staff, including possible amendments to the permit. And the Board approved certain amendments to the permit -- to the draft permit.

The Board did not approve issuance of the permit at that meeting. The Board did direct that documents received by the Board between the November and December

meetings be subject to a minimum public comment period. That public comment period has been concluded and the Board is meeting today to continue deliberations on the draft permit.

There is not opportunity for public comment at today's meeting. The process established in the Board's regulations for receiving public input on the draft permit was completed at the November meeting.

And I'll say that again. We

-- we've had a lot of comment, both in the

public comment periods -- written comments

as well as the -- the oral comments that we

took in November, as well as the public

hearing we did in -- in the Buckingham area.

The statutory and regulatory opportunity for public comment on the draft permit in a Board meeting is to allow the public -- in other words, the reason why you have public comment at the Board meeting is to allow the public the opportunity to respond in summary of comments that provided by the Department to the Board. Because in

most comment periods, all those comments go to the Department. The Department prepares a summary of them, tell us what the summary was and what their response is.

And that -- the public discussion after that is to -- to make sure that the people who submitted comments got their comments heard directly by the Board. And that's already occurred.

In order to expedite the process, public comments received during this recent minimum public comment period have been handled differently. They've been sent directly to each of the members to review.

So DEQ didn't do any summary.

Be assured that we got all the comments. I

-- I can address that later. But I got a
ton of comments.

Every comment that got into my inbox during the -- during that comment period, I actually personally looked at and read. So -- so in this case, your comments have been seen by members of the Board. So there's been no summary of the comments

provided by the Department today. And since there's no summary of the comments, there's no -- no reason for the public to try to comment on the comments because we've seen them directly.

And that's why there's no public opportunity for comment at this meeting. Staff will make a brief presentation today on the draft permit and will be advising the Board of activities that have occurred since our last meeting.

And before that, there's some sort of housekeeping things. I mentioned before the meeting started, I'll say it again. We're here at a public venue.

There is a -- at the good host of the people of Doubletree by Hilton to allow us to be here. But there are other meetings going on in this same -- in the same venue.

So we have to -- there's some more stringent -- it'll be more stringent rules today for -- for the conduct of the meeting. Because we -- we just can't interrupt what's going on in this place of

business. So conduct that interferes with 1 an orderly and efficient Board meeting or 2 interferes with the staff presentation or 3 Board discussions is prohibited and will 4 5 result in your removal from the meeting. As I -- as I mentioned, 6 7 another organization is having a meeting next door. And conduct that interferes with 8 9 that will result in the removal from this meeting, and perhaps even from the grounds. 10 We've had -- several times 11 we've had public meetings. And we have had, 12 I'll call them outbursts and demonstrations, 13 in the past. And at times, we've -- we've 14 15 also had -- had the security presence available. 16 Today we're going to -- I've 17 been advised that we're going to have to --18 need to be tighter on that. So they'll --19 20 we have a --21 MAN IN GALLERY: We'll not do the 22 cop shock for you. 23 24 We'll have -- we'll MR. LANGFORD: 25

have to do essentially a zero tolerance policy on -- on any outbursts or comments.

And I will -- aside from that one I just heard, if that occurs, we'll ask the -- we'll ask the -- the police to escort that person out of the room.

Because we just -- we've got to maintain order in here. Okay. So the rules have been posted, copies of those are around. And they were at the table out front.

There -- you probably already know, they're prohibiting the possession or use of noise-making devices, clapping or shouting and shouting out and -- and those apply even when the meeting is in recess.

Sorry for having to do that, but we are in a different venue than we usually are. And we need to maintain the dignity here. Now I will call on Mr. Dowd for a presentation -- short presentation, I've been assured, on what's going on.

MR. DOWD: Much shorter than the last presentation I gave, Mr. Chairman. Is

that working? It is.

MR. LANGFORD: It is now.

MR. DOWD: Well good morning,
ladies and gentlemen of the Board. I am
Michael Dowd, Director of the Air and

8 Renewal Energy Division for DEQ.

I'm appearing before the Board today to present the DEQ staff's recommendation concerning the proposed permit for the Buckingham County Compressor Station.

To provide a brief background, the Buckingham Compressor Station is one of three compressor stations planned for the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. It is the only Atlantic Coast Pipeline compressor station in Virginia and will be the most stringently regulated of the three.

The proposed compressor station is a minor stationary source under Virginia's Air Permit regulations. But for all intents and purposes, DEQ treated it as a major source in the permit process to

better assure the protection of human health. Protection of public health and the environment are DEQ's most important goals.

All Virginia Air permits require both state of the art pollution controls and assurance the source will not cause any violation of EPA's health-based national ambient air quality standards, or Virginia State air toxic standards.

The state of the art pollution control all permitted sources must meet is known as best available control technology.

DEQ conducted a thorough best available control technology review for the Buckingham Compressor Station.

Emission limits in the proposed permit are the lowest for any natural gas compressor turbines in the country.

Selective catalytic reduction will be -- will be used to control NOx emissions from the turbines down to 3.75 parts per million (ppm) by dry volume at 15% oxygen on a three-hour average. In addition, the proposed permit has the

tightest limits on the venting of natural gas found at any compressor station in the United States. And an innovative vent-gas recirculation system will be used to control VOC and methane emissions.

The proposed permit will set a very tough and rigorous national standard that future compressor stations will have to meet across the country. Next slide.

In addition to the application of best available control technology, all the air permits must assure the source will not cause any violation of health-based air quality standards.

In this case, computer
modeling was done using the worst case
scenario for each pollutant. The air
modeling shows that emissions from the
Buckingham Compressor Station will not cause
an exceedance [sp] of any national ambient
air quality standard and will not violate
any Virginia State air toxic standards for
formaldehyde and hexane. The bottom line is
here that the Buckingham Compressor Station
will be the most stringently regulated

compressor station in the country and that the public's health will be protected. The proposed compressor station permit underwent a public comment period that ran from August 8th until September 21st.

Over 5300 written comments
were received. In addition, a public
hearing was held on the proposed permit in
Buckingham County, which 191 people attended
and at which 60 individuals provided oral
comments. Next slide.

At the Board's meeting on November 8th, the Board received additional oral comment from members of the public who had previously provided written comments during the public comment period.

At the meeting on November

9th, DEQ staff gave a presentation on the

proposed permit as well as a summary and

response for the comments that were received

during the public comment period.

Dominion gave a presentation as well. However, the Board -- on November 9th -- deferred a decision on the proposed compressor station permit pending receipt of

additional information the Board asked DEQ to provide regarding site suitability and demographics. DEQ provided the information requested by the Board prior to the Board's next meeting on December 19th.

In addition, before the

December 19th meeting, DEQ staff drafted
several amendments to the proposed permit at
the request of certain Board members that
were based on public comment, Dominion's
presentation at the November meeting,
discussions between DEQ and individual Board
members and discussions between DEQ and
Dominion.

All of those amendments served to make the permit more stringent than that proposed by staff. They included new provisions to require the installation and operation of continuous emission monitors on the turbines to measure emissions of nitrogen oxides.

They also include provisions requiring monitoring of volatile organic compounds and carbon monoxide to help assure ongoing compliance with the permit's

emission limits. And finally, the new provisions require ambient monitoring for nitrogen dioxide, PM2.5 and volatile organic compounds to help assure that the compressor station's emissions do not violate national ambient air quality standards.

DEQ worked with Dominion to assure the accuracy of the language and has obtained Dominion's concurrence that that amended language was acceptable.

And while those amendments prepared by DEQ staff on the ninth -December 19th meeting are not officially a part of the DEQ staff recommendation, DEQ does not object to any of those changes.

At the December 19th meeting,
DEQ staff gave a presentation on site
suitability and environmental justice issues
which encompassed a discussion of the
material on site suitability and
demographics that was provided to the Board
by DEQ prior to that meeting. And -- and at
this point, I'd just like to reiterate a
point I made at the December 19th meeting.
DEQ focuses on risk. Regardless of the

demographics of the area surrounding the compressor station, the compressor station will not cause a disproportionate adverse impact to the community for two reasons.

First, the residents of the area surrounding the compressor station already -- are already breathing air that is cleaner than the air breathed by 90% of the residents of Virginia.

Second, although our air modeling does indicate that the compressor station will cause a slight increase in air pollution concentration, the increase is slight.

And model concentration of air pollution after the compressor station starts operation will remain well below air quality standards.

The residents of the area will continue to breathe air much cleaner than that breathed by the vast majority of Virginia residents. Now getting back to the December 19th meeting, DEQ also --

For

MR. LANGFORD: Excuse me.

those people that have cough problems, please go out into the hallway until you're able to participate without coughing, disrupting the process. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. DOWD: Again, at the December 19th meeting, staff also presented to the Board the amendments to the proposed permit that I referred to earlier.

On December 19th, the vote -the Board voted to revise the proposed
permit to include the amendments presented
by DEQ staff.

But the Board, again, deferred taking final action on the proposed permit pending completion of another public comment period.

The public comment period was to be minimum in time and limited in scope to documents concerning demographics and site suitability that were provided to the Board prior to the December 19th meeting. The public comment period commenced on December 21st and concluded on January 4th. Okay. I will now move to staff

recommendations. The staff recommends that based on, one, the Board book material that contains a memorandum to the Board, a clean copy of the draft permit, a track change copy of the draft final permit, the permit engineering analysis, the air quality analysis review, a list of commenters and a sampling of all written comments received and a summary of the response to public comments.

Two, the public comments made available to the Board. Three, the agency files on the draft permit including the application for a permit. Four, public comments made at the Board meeting.

Five, staff presentations.

Six, the additional documents and public comments submitted to the Board on the documents from December 21, 2018, through January 4th, 2019.

And seven, Board discussions and based on consideration of the reasonableness of the activity involved and the regulations proposed to control it pursuant to Virginia Code Section

10.1-1307E. First, the Board find that; A, the permit has been prepared in conformance with all applicable statutes, regulations and agency practices; B, the limits and conditions in the permit have been established to protect public health and the environment; and C, all public comments relevant to the permit have been considered.

Second, staff recommends the Board approve the permit and conditions as presented at the November 9th, 2018, meeting with the additional amendments approved by the Board at the December 19th, 2018, meeting that comply with applicable laws and regulations as they further respond to public concerns and has been agreed to by the applicant.

And I will add that, as I mentioned earlier, technically while the staff does not formally recommend the amendments approved by the Board at the December 19th meeting, staff has no objection to their inclusion in the final permit. Third, the staff recommends that the Board authorize the Director to issue

the permit as approved by the Board. 1 further recommends that the Board 3 incorporate the above referenced memorandum permit -- and permit engineering analysis 4 5 and response to comments into which decision to approve the permit. That concludes staff 6 recommendation. 7

8

9

2

MR. LANGFORD: Thank you, Mr. Dowd. There may be questions --

11

12

10

MR. DOWD: Sure.

13

14

15

16

17

MR. LANGFORD: -- of staff. -- before that, I'd like to kind of lay out the way we -- the way things are going to flow. The DEO has made their -- made their presentation.

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Board will have deliberations. Under Robert's Rules of Order, which is the way you run boards of this type, in order to have robust discussion, we need to have a motion on the floor. So there will be a motion made on the floor and seconded. And then we will

discuss our various thoughts and -- and so 1 forth about this before actually taking a 2 3 vote. So just because there's a motion made doesn't mean it's going to get passed 4 5 necessarily. So that's kind of -- kind of 6 7 letting the public know how things are going to -- going to flow. First I'll say, are 8 9 there any questions of DEQ staff from members of the Board? Yeah. 10 11 MS. MORENO: Mr. Dowd 12 13 14 MR. DOWD: Yes. 15 MS. MORENO: -- you addressed 16 disproportionate adverse impacts on the 17 community. And I was hoping that you might 18 19 elaborate --20 MR. DOWD: 21 Sure. 22 MS. MORENO: -- on the analysis 23 that you performed to arrive at that 24

conclusion.

25

MR. DOWD: Well, the analysis took a couple of different prongs. One of them is the most important aspect of it was the air quality modeling analysis that was done.

It was extensive modeling and the modeling indicates that for -- for all the pollutants, and in particular the PM2.5 pollutant that I know is of concern to several of the Board members.

That even under worst case scenarios, the model concentrations -- at the highest emission limits, at the highest emissions allowed under the permit for the compressor station will result in highest concentrations of PM2.5 well below the national ambient air quality standards for PM2.5.

Now when you couple that with the -- with -- and we looked at it on the EJSCREEN, when you look at the percentile of 2.5 risk that the EJSCREEN presents for the area around the Buckingham Compressor Station, it indicates that that area has a present -- you know, without the compressor station, the residents of the area around

the -- around the area breathe air that is 1 in the top 10% of clean air in the State for 2 3 PM2.5. Meaning, the residents are already breathing air that is better than 90% of the 4 -- of the rest of the residents of Virginia. 5 And when you couple that with 6 7 the -- our air quality modeling, which indicates that the increase in emission and 8 9 increase in ambient concentrations that will be caused by the compressor station are so 10 marginal that the -- you know, the resulting 11 concentrations are still way, way, way below 12 the national ambient air quality standards 13 and way -- and the remaining air quality --14 15 the air quality at that point, even with the compressor station, will still be better 16 than that breathed by the vast majority of 17 Virginians. 18 19 20 MR. LANGFORD: Thank you. Yes, 21 Ms. Moreno, one more. 22 MR. DOWD: 23 Sure. 24 This is for Director MS. MORENO: 25

Paylor. I was hoping that you could address the health assessment you discussed of the Department of Health.

MR. PAYLOR: Yeah, happy to. As I mentioned at our last Board meeting, the Health Department has agreed that they could do a letter of health consultation, which involves -- it will take two phases.

The first phase will be to take the data that we have already used in our projected analysis and run it through -- through their computer projections.

And so they would propose, and we are working with them now, to -- to do an analysis of before this -- this station is built.

Should the station ever be built, then they have agreed to -- and would like very much -- to do a further analysis based on empirical monitored data to confirm that projections were what we expected them to be. So that's the path that we're on at this point.

MS. MORENO: Thank you. 1 2 3 MR. LANGFORD: Are there other questions of staff? Seeing none, thank you, 4 Mr. Dowd. Is there a motion? 5 6 7 MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I have a motion. William H. Ferguson. I move that, 8 one, based on the Board book material that 9 contains a memorandum to the Board, a clean 10 copy of the draft permit. 11 A track change copy of the 12 draft final permit, the permit engineering 13 analysis. The air quality analyses review, 14 a list of commenters, a sampling of all 15 written comments received and a summary of 16 17 and response to the public comments. The public comments made 18 available to the Board. The agency files on 19 20 the draft permit including the application for a permit. 21 Public comments made at the 22 Board meeting, the staff presentation, the 23

24

25

outline of possible amendments and amendment

-- amended permit, the additional documents

and public documents submitted to the Board and the documents from December 21, 2018 through January 4, 2019, and Board discussions.

And based on the consideration of the reasonableness of the activity involved and the regulations proposed to control it pursuant to 10.1-1307E, A, find that the permit has been prepared in conformance with all applicable statutes, regulations and agency practices.

Two, the limits and conditions in the permit have been established to protect public health and the environment. Three, all public comments relevant to the permit have been considered.

B, approve the permit and conditions as presented at the November 9, 2018, meeting with additional amendments approved by the Board at the December 19 meeting 2018 that comply with applicable laws and regulations as they further respond to public concerns and have been agreed to by the applicant. And C, authorize the Director to issue the permit as approved by

the Board. Two, incorporate the above-1 referenced memorandum permit engineering 2 3 analysis response to comments and the outline of possible amendments into its 4 5 decision to approve the permit. And three, state that the 6 7 additional amendments to the permit presented by staff, approved by the Board at 8 9 the December 19, 2018, meeting are in compliance with applicable laws and 10 regulations as they further respond to 11 public concerns that have been agreed to by 12 the applicant. 13 Four, and finally, state that 14 15 the Board does not adopt any legal use experienced by DEQ regarding the Board 16 authority under Code -- Virginia Code 17 Section 10.1-1307E. Thank you. 18 19 20 MR. LANGFORD: We have a motion. Is there a second? 21 22 I second the motion. MS. MORENO: 23 24 MR. LANGFORD: Okay. We'll now --25

we'll now -- we'll now have discussion on 1 the motion. Let me go first. I'll take the 2 3 chairman's prerogative here. I -- I've served on this Board for more than 16 years, 4 5 actually. Probably longer than most anybody else has. 6 7 MAN IN GALLERY: Why weren't you 8 fired? 9 10 MR. LANGFORD: That was an 11 outburst. Can someone escort that gentleman 12 out? 13 14 15 LADY IN GALLERY: What? What? 16 MR. LANGFORD: I told you at the 17 beginning what we were going to do. We're 18 19 just -- you've been warned. Thank you. 20 officer, if they agree to be silent coming back, they can come back in. 21 I spent a lot of time on this 22 Board and a lot of time on controversial 23 permits. I personally spent many hours 24

25

looking at this -- this permit applicant and

this -- this issue. I spent hours and hours looking at the most recent comments that many of you have submitted. I looked -- as I said earlier, I looked at every one that was in my inbox.

And -- and made a judgment about what you said and what it meant. Some commenters specifically asked that we not consider the community engagement report with the proffered money. I did not.

This is not -- this is not part of the draft permit for the facility and I did not consider it. Several commenters cited Section 1307E of the State Air Pollution law, and that those should govern.

And that we had the authority to do that. So I looked at those in some detail. I -- I'll address them in reverse order.

The -- number four is the scientific and economic practicality of reducing or eliminating the discharge resulting from such activity, which means the compressor station. As we heard today,

DEQ used a best available control technology review. And they required control systems and procedures much more stringent than the other two compressor stations on the pipeline that are located in other states.

The final -- the draft permit has more stringent requirements than any similar compressor station anywhere in the United States. My conclusion is that this criteria was met.

Number three, the suitability of the activity, meaning the compressor station, to the area in which is it located. This has been a topic of some controversy.

And in fact, I guess there's some court cases pending about -- about parts of it. The Air Division has long had a practice that site suitability be determined by the local governing body except as to questions involving air quality.

The Buckingham County Board of Supervisors certified to the DEQ that the proposed site met the local requirements.

There is court challenge involving the Board

of Supervisors' action that has not yet been 1 resolved. But the certification by the 2 local governing body still remains intact. 3 Based on that, my conclusion is that this 4 criteria is met. 5 Number two, the social and 6 economic value of the activity involved. 7 Again, the activity is the compressor 8 There is economic value added to 9 station. the community in the form of tax revenue. 10 There is economic value 11 reduced in the community from reported 12 reduced home values and other considerations 13 mentioned by commenters. 14 Social value may be diminished 15 in the local area due to possible noise or 16 light issues. I am not qualified or have 17 the expertise to determine the net value of 18 those puts and takes. 19 20 (At this time, members in the gallery 21 disrupted the meeting and began talking all at once.) 22 23 MR. LANGFORD: Those issues were, 24

in my view, addressed in the consideration

25

of the Buckingham County certification. My conclusion is that this criteria is met.

LADY IN GALLERY: No.

MR. LANGFORD: Number one, the character and nature of injury to or interference with safety and health in the reasonable use of property which is caused or threatened to be caused.

about the safety of living near the compressor station. Response to the previous comments section indicate that the permittee is working with the local authorities to address those safety concerns.

I spent a lot of time regarding health issues. One key part of that depends on whether the area around the facility is considered an environmental justice community based on minority status, income or other factors. This Board requested additional information on the demographics of the area, which is in part

what this -- the last comment period also dealt with. And we received comments and analysis of demographic methodology on both sides of this issue.

For purpose of my review, I have assumed that it may be an EJ community. Or even if it's not, the community closest to the compressor station has an EJ characteristic for what sometimes EPA refers to as a hot spot, or a smaller concentrated of minority population that might be effected.

So I am simplifying things, but okay, so if it's an EJ issue, what does that mean? There generally are two elements to consider. First, inclusion of the EJ community in the process.

And second, avoiding disproportionate impact. The inclusion of the EJ community, I admit, the authorities -- various authorities -- were late in identifying potential EJ issues. Note, the record I think is pretty clear on that. But certainly, during this Board's consideration, issues and input from the EJ

1	community have been robust.
2	
3	LADY IN GALLERY: You're not
4	listening.
5	
6	MR. LANGFORD: What about
7	disproportionate adverse impact? So
8	commenters cited the Commonwealth Energy
9	Policy at Section 67.102-11.
10	Insure the development of new
11	or expansion of existing energy resources or
12	facilities does not have a disproportionate
13	adverse impact on economically disadvantaged
14	or minority communities.
15	That same policy at 67.105-5,
16	just a few paragraphs above, says insure the
17	availability of affordable natural gas
18	throughout the Commonwealth by expanding
19	Virginia's natural gas distribution
20	
21	(At this time, members of the gallery
22	disrupted the meeting and began talking and making
23	noises.)
24	
25	MR. LANGFORD: What I'm what I'm

reading to you is my personal assessment and 1 view. It does not necessarily mean it's 2 3 anything from anyone else. But this is the way I spent many, many hours looking at the 4 details of this. 5 6 7 LADY IN GALLERY: We spent four years on this, dude. Honestly. We are 8 9 allowing y'all to do this today. We are allowing y'all --10 11 MR. LANGFORD: Officers, if you 12 would escort her out. 13 14 15 LADY IN GALLERY: -- to do this. I'll leave, don't worry. But we're allowing 16 17 you -- you -- we're allowing you. If we --18 19 MR. LANGFORD: Five-minute recess. 20 LADY IN GALLERY: -- wanted, we can 21 shut this whole meeting down. 22 23 (The State Air Pollution Control Board 24 meeting went off the record at 11:19 a.m., and 25

1 immediately resumed. The taking of testimony resumed as follows:) 2 3 MR. LANGFORD: Folks, I know you 4 don't like some of what you're hearing. You 5 -- as you said, you've had -- you've had 6 7 lots of opportunity to put all your comments in. 8 9 And you got to let this process work out. Just -- it doesn't --10 it's not helpful -- it's not helpful to slow 11 it down or interfere with it. 12 13 14 MAN IN GALLERY: We will stop it. 15 MR. LANGFORD: Officer, there's one 16 more that needs to leave. 17 18 19 MAN IN GALLERY: We will stop this 20 pipeline. 21 MR. LANGFORD: We can continue 22 removing people until the room's empty. 23 Okay. DEQ has conducted air dispersion 24 modeling on the pollutants of most 25

significance in their presentation. They talked about that. The fence line maximum concentrations were below the national ambient air quality standard or the State toxic standard as applicable.

The exposure to PM2.5 is considered safe by the EPA max, that's the national air quality standard, if concentrations in the ambient air are below those standards.

There -- those standards are established in the Clean Air Act. But the primary standard which we're talking about, they're designed to protect human health with an adequate margin of safety including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly and individuals suffering from respiratory diseases.

Many pollutants have a threshold concentration, below which they have no discernable impact on the population. Particulate matter, however, does not have such a threshold -- at least by all the scientific data indicates it does not. And any concentrations have some

impact. Compressor station will have a potential to emit PM2.5. The air dispersion modeling shows at the maximum operation, as Mr. Dowd was saying earlier.

The concentrations of PM2.5 at the fence line of the -- of the compressor station will increase by -- I think the information shows 20 to 40%.

But that -- they're still 30 to 40% below the standard that was set to protect sensitive populations. I went further than that. I -- I had some -- I had some concerns about PM2.5.

So I -- I inquired of DEQ staff about not just what were the concentrations going to be near the compressor station, but what are the concentrations near the residents that are most closely effected.

And they have that data. When they -- when you do modeling -- sorry, I'm an engineer so I give you more information than you need. But when you do that modeling, there's a whole grid of what they call receptors that the computer calculates

for all around. And -- and several of those are right near where some of the identified homes are. So I went to look what those were. The -- actually, the presentation -- I think it was in November or December, I forget which.

DEQ had made a comment that those numbers at the residences were 50 to 80% lower than at the fence line. Then what I did was, I went further than that.

I -- I actually looked at the concentrations and because as in the -- in the environmental impact statement, FERC was also talking about -- about potential for -- for this.

I went and looked and did some research on -- on papers, that is publications from various sources. The Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine comments that while poor outdoor air quality has not been clearly linked to incidents of asthma, the ambient pollutants such as particulate matter and diesel exhaust, outdoor air quality is worse in urban environments where greater proportions of

people of low socio and economic status
live. That's irreverent -- irrelevant. The
PM is -- has been an issue across the state.
We monitor for all over the state in
continuous monitors.

The -- it's worse in urban areas. The -- the background particulate matter in the -- basically in Buckingham County and the area around is about 15 micrograms per cubic meters.

If -- if we do the modeling at what the impact of what the compressor station is and look out at the closest homes, there is an -- an increase predicted of about one microgram per cubic meter based on one of the standards.

That's still way, way below the -- the air quality standard, which is set at 35. And it is still, as Mr. Dowd said, it still relates -- equates to some of the cleanest air -- continues to be some of the cleanest air in -- in Virginia.

(At this time, persons in the gallery disrupted the meeting and began speaking.)

MR. LANGFORD: Okay. You can have 1 a difference of opinion, but that's --2 that's what's been stated and that's what 3 actually the data shows. 4 5 MAN IN GALLERY: You're missing the 6 7 point. 8 9 MR. LANGFORD: Numerous studies have linked PM2.5 to many health problems, 10 increased asthma to hospital visits. A 11 study from the Journal of American Medical 12 Association found that for every 10 13 14 microgram per cubic meter increase and daily 15 PM2.5 exposure, over the course of a whole summer, the mortality rate didn't change 16 much. 17 It was slightly more than a 18 one percent increase. Even -- even when the 19 20 levels were still within the 35 milligrams per day limit. 21 That's an increase of 10 that 22 23

made around one percent increase in -- in impacts on health. We're talking about one microgram or a 10th of that. And -- and so

24

it's -- it's much lower than what the -- the 1 Harvard folks found in their study. 2 3 LADY IN GALLERY: So put it in your 4 5 back yard to --6 7 MR. LANGFORD: And EPA's guidance 8 9 10 LADY IN GALLERY: Put it in your back yard. 11 12 13 GALLERY MEMBER: Yeah, put it in your back yard. 14 15 MR. LANGFORD: Officer, I need some 16 more help. In EPA's guidance on 17 disproportionate impact, they say that in 18 19 light of the various facts, it is the decision-maker that has to make a judgment. 20 That's out of their -- out of 21 their technical guidance for assessing 22 environmental justice and regulatory 23 actions. So it's up to the decision-maker 24 to determine how important these facts are. 25

And I conclude that there is a low 1 probability of a disproportionate adverse 2 3 impact to the hot spot of the local residents. 4 5 LADY IN GALLERY: Put it in your 6 7 back yard. 8 GALLERY MEMBER: Move there 9 yourself. 10 11 MAN IN GALLERY: Right. 12 13 MR. LANGFORD: Actually --14 15 actually, my back yard has higher levels already than that. So I live in Montgomery 16 County and there's a big highway next to it. 17 Okay. Our -- that's my 18 19 comment or discussion. Do any other Board 20 members have anything they want to say or add or questions? 21 22 Thank you for MR. FERGUSON: 23 coming. Top-level military business or what 24 25 shipbuilding, seafood and elected officials

realize that coastal Virginia, which has a 1 population of over 2M and is Virginia's 2 industrial and maritime bread basket does 3 not have the natural gas infrastructure 4 5 required to accommodate the areas --6 7 LADY IN GALLERY: If you keep building pipelines, you're not going to have 8 9 land to live on. There's a global warming issue. You all think -- you all are old. 10 11 MR. LANGFORD: Officer. 12 13 14 LADY IN GALLERY: You know, we are 15 going to be around a little bit longer and this is not your decision to make. I am the 16 17 18 19 (At this time, members in the gallery 20 disrupted the meeting and began applauding.) 21 This is bullshit. LADY IN GALLERY: 22 This is not what people want. There's lots 23

of people who need help.

24

MR. FERGUSON: Hampton Roads is so 1 short of natural gas capacity --2 3 LADY IN GALLERY: That's a lie. 4 5 MR. FERGUSON: -- that Virginia's 6 7 natural gas --8 GALLERY MEMBER: And it's 9 sickening. 10 11 LADY IN GALLERY: Hampton Roads are 12 under water. 13 14 15 MR. FERGUSON: Virginia natural gas can not offer guaranteed service to a new 16 large customer anywhere east of 17 Williamsburg, Virginia. Last year, due to 18 19 cold weather, our businesses had their service curtailed and had to shut down. 20 Sending workers home as there 21 was not enough pipeline capacity to serve 22 demand. We're now paying over \$100M or more 23 for natural gas this winter than we would 24 have if the pipeline had been in service. 25

\$100M. Adjacent rural counties that have 1 been left out of the now booming economy 2 have not had the natural resources to 3 attract new businesses, seeing its 4 5 population either go on public assistance or move away. 6 7 Rural residents are suggested -- are subjected to burning truckloads of 8 firewood in their wood stoves. Farmers need 9 10 11 LADY IN GALLERY: It's doable. 12 13 MR. FERGUSON: 14 Farmers need 15 affordable natural gas for silage, feed lots to drive and store crops. Natural gas is a 16 direct replacement for diesel, coal-fired 17 facilities, wood-fired stoves and 18 19 undependable solar and wind-driven plants. 20 (At this time, persons in the gallery 21 disrupted the meeting and began talking.) 22 23 It's not your job. 24 MAN IN GALLERY:

1	MR. LANGFORD: Officer.
2	
3	MAN IN GALLERY: Congress is not
4	your job, pal.
5	
6	(At this time, gallery disrupted meeting and
7	began applauding.)
8	
9	MR. LANGFORD: Thank you.
10	
11	MAN IN GALLERY: You don't live
12	next to it, pal.
13	
14	MR. FERGUSON: In my hometown
15	
16	LADY IN GALLERY: How much did
17	Dominion pay you?
18	
19	MR. FERGUSON: mountains of coal
20	in my hometown, mountains of coal create
21	a filthy environment and health problems for
22	low income neighborhoods. Natural gas
23	provides an alternative to coal.
24	
25	(At this time, members of the gallery

disrupted the meeting and began speaking.) 1 2 MR. FERGUSON: While solar fields 3 are wonderful for chopping off the energy 4 spikes in the summer months, solar simply 5 can not work in a cloud cover and take 6 hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile 7 farmland and forests out of production. 8 9 Replacing just one modern gas-generating plant with solar panels would 10 require the same acreage as the entire 11 Washington, DC, MSA. 12 A project of this type must 13 14 work its way through dozens of layers of 15 regulators -- local, state and federal -- to garner support for the project. 16 17 LADY IN GALLERY: Or get paid by 18 19 Dominion. 20 MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. A local 21 engineering department reviews that 22

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. A local engineering department reviews that whereupon it must satisfy their specific requirements. It then must go to a local planning staff, completely engineered at a

23

24

cost of millions. The project then needs to 1 go to a planning commission made up of 2 3 volunteers from the community. Then it goes to an elected --4 democratically elected -- board of 5 supervisors who can send it back for 6 7 revisions for whatever reason, noise, landscaping, land use, etcetera. 8 9 This pump station passed unopposed by every local democratically 10 elected official, including Louise Lucas, 11 Buckingham County State Senator. 12 Ms. Lucas is an active member 13 14 of the Virginia Legislative Black Caucus, elected vice-chair of outreach within the 15 Democratic Party of Virginia, Golden 16 Heritage member and past president of the 17 NAACP, and charter member of the Martin 18 Luther King Leadership steering committee. 19 20 Stop putting 21 MAN IN GALLERY: people in --22 23 She's wrong, too. 24 LADY IN GALLERY: 25

1	MR. FERGUSON: To suggest that
2	these local citizens are effective or so
3	strictly by campaign funds is not realistic
4	or factual.
5	
6	LADY IN GALLERY: Bull.
7	
8	MR. FERGUSON: My point is this
9	thank you. My point is this, there's a
10	proven need for a pipeline and it's a very
11	serious matter
12	
13	(At this time, members of the gallery
14	disrupted the meeting and began speaking.)
15	
16	LADY IN GALLERY: You have the
17	responsibility to the earth and humanity
18	
19	MR. LANGFORD: Officer.
20	
21	LADY IN GALLERY: and to your
22	residents and the people that pay taxes.
23	
24	(At this time, people in the gallery began
25	applauding.)

```
LADY IN GALLERY: You have the
1
          responsibility to protect all of us here.
2
3
4
                   MR. FERGUSON:
                                   Thank you.
5
                   LADY IN GALLERY: You have a
6
7
          responsibility for all of us.
8
                   MAN IN GALLERY: No pipeline.
9
10
                                   Thank you. There is
                   MR. FERGUSON:
11
         a proven need for the pipeline and
12
13
                   LADY IN GALLERY: You have a
14
15
          responsibility --
16
                   MR. FERGUSON: -- and this is a
17
         various -- this is a very serious matter.
18
19
             (At this time, members of the gallery
20
   disrupted the meeting and began speaking all at
21
   once.)
22
23
                   MR. FERGUSON:
                                   Thank you.
24
25
```

LADY IN GALLERY: Oh, my God. Quit 1 this and make the right decision. 2 3 MR. FERGUSON: This is a very 4 serious matter for the families in coastal 5 and southside Virginia. The applicant has 6 revised his plan to address the concerns of 7 the staff and elected officials at every 8 level, with a full directive -- with a full 9 directive from the governors who appointed 10 11 us. 12 Full directive 13 LADY IN GALLERY: from Dominion Power. 14 15 (At this time, members of the gallery 16 disrupted the meeting by applauding and speaking.) 17 18 19 MR. LANGFORD: Officer. 20 MR. FERGUSON: And the compressor 21 station developers have sufficient financial 22 backing, which offsets any liabilities that 23 could possibly occur. 24 25

MAN IN GALLERY: Oh. Yeah, right. 1 2 MR. FERGUSON: The facility will 3 provide an alternate source of energy when 4 older interstate pipelines need repair and 5 replacement. 6 The facility will create 7 millions of dollars in taxes and thousands 8 9 of jobs to these southside rural counties that have traditionally been left behind. 10 Thank you. The facility will 11 also help insure that the military bases in 12 southeast Virginia meet stringent 13 regulations when future rounds of budget 14 15 cuts and base realignments and closings are implemented. 16 17 LADY IN GALLERY: Why aren't they 18 19 here then? 20 MR. FERGUSON: It will assist in 21 the development of thousands of high-paying 22 tech jobs and new infrastructure needed for 23 the new --24 25

MAN IN GALLERY: That's out of 1 The jobs go to people from out of 2 state. 3 state. 4 5 LADY IN GALLERY: We the people -not we the people. 6 7 MR. LANGFORD: Officer. 8 9 10 MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. It will assist in the development of thousands of 11 high-paying jobs --12 13 LADY IN GALLERY: 14 Be the sheep. 15 Don't eat the sheep. Don't eat the earth. It is sacred, the people are sacred. 16 17 MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. 18 Thousands of pay -- high-paying tech jobs 19 and new infrastructure needed for the new 20 undersea fiber optic network coming to 21 Virginia Beach from Africa, Europe and South 22 America. This will insure that our port, 23 which is being expanded to match the ports 24 in South Carolina and Georgia, will have the 25

1	capacity to expand with new industrial
2	warehousing and assembly plants. Therefore
3	therefore wrapping this baby up. It
4	is our directive and obligation to approve
5	the pump station if it if it's lawful and
6	exceeds all safety measures.
7	
8	MAN IN GALLERY: It's not lawful.
9	
10	MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. The
11	region needs the energy. The state needs
12	the energy.
13	
14	LADY IN GALLERY: No, we don't.
15	
16	MR. FERGUSON: For these reasons
17	and many more, I support this project
18	without reservation.
19	
20	MAN IN GALLERY: Shame.
21	
22	(At this time, members of the gallery
23	disrupted the meeting and began speaking.)
24	
25	MAN IN GALLERY: Renewable energy.

This is not the answer. Shame. 1 2 (At this time, the gallery disrupted the 3 meeting and began chanting shame.) 4 5 MR. LANGFORD: Thank you. Let's 6 7 not do that again or we're going to recess and leave and you can yell at yourselves. 8 9 We have -- we have to maintain order. And you're done. Is there anyone else who would 10 like to comment? Ms. Moreno. 11 12 MS. MORENO: I would like to thank 13 members of the public for your engagement, 14 15 vigor and the trust that you have placed in this Board. 16 17 LADY IN GALLERY: You don't impress 18 19 me. 20 GALLERY MEMBER: You betrayed it. 21 22 I have seen it. I have MS. MORENO: 23 seen you, I have heard you. I have taken a 24 careful look and have worked with DEQ to 25

insure that the permit requirements are stringent, protective of human health and the environment, enforceable and that DEQ's oversight is real.

I have considered the data on both sides and have assumed that the community at issue is an environmental justice community.

I have requested and considered an analysis on whether there may be any disproportionate adverse impacts on the affected community.

In addition, I have requested a health assessment and Mr. Paylor has worked with the Department of Health to insure that a health assessment is conducted and that it starts right away.

I also visited the site to see it for myself and to put into context what you told me in your comments. And I have considered all of your comments on all issues, including site suitability. I do not agree with DEQ's views on the scope of the Board's authority under Virginia Code Section one -- under Virginia Code Section

1 10.1-1307E. In my view, the Board has broad 2 authority and discretion under the statutory 3 provisions enacted by the General Assembly. 4 Having said that, the Board's authority is 5 not without limitations. 6 For example, the merits of the

For example, the merits of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline are not before the Board. This is not to understate the significance of the matter before the Board. But simply to provide a context for the decision that we are tasked with making today.

The matter before us is whether to approve a minor stationary source air permit for the proposed Buckingham Compressor Station.

LADY IN GALLERY: Our lives are on the line.

MS. MORENO: I will limit my comments to that in the interest of time.

But I would like to conclude my remarks by acknowledging the significant contributions made by Sam Bleecher [sp] and Rebecca Reuben

```
to the work of the State Air Pollution
1
          Control Board. And once again, I thank you
2
3
4
5
             (At this time, members of the gallery
   disrupted the meeting by applauding and speaking.)
6
7
                   MAN IN GALLERY: Did you read her
8
9
          op-ed?
10
                   MR. LANGFORD:
                                   Seeing no other
11
          comments, we'll call the question.
12
          Ms. Berndt, would you please call the roll,
13
          please?
14
15
                   MS. BERNDT: You want a roll call?
16
17
                   MR. LANGFORD: I think we probably
18
19
          need one. Yes.
20
                   MS. BERNDT:
                                Okey-dokey.
21
22
          Ms. Moreno.
23
                   MS. MORENO:
24
                                 Yes.
25
```

1	MS. BERNDT: Mr. Ferguson.
2	
3	MR. FERGUSON: Yes.
4	
5	MAN IN GALLERY: Don't do it.
6	
7	MS. BERNDT: Ms. Rovner.
8	
9	MS. ROVNER: Yes.
10	
11	MAN IN GALLERY: Don't do it.
12	EDTIFIED COD
13	MS. BERNDT: Mr. Langford.
14	
15	MR. LANGFORD: Yes.
16	
17	MS. BERNDT: So it's four to
18	
19	LADY IN GALLERY: Protect our
20	children.
21	
22	(At this time, members in the gallery
23	disrupted the meeting by chanting.)
24	
25	MR. LANGFORD: The motion is

```
passed.
1
2
             (At this time, the gallery disrupted the
3
   meeting by chanting and shouting.)
4
5
                    MR. LANGFORD: This meeting is
6
          adjourned.
7
8
             (At this time, the gallery began shouting.)
9
10
             (The State Air Pollution Control Board
11
   meeting concluded at 11:43 a.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF THE COURT REPORTER 1 2 I, Debroah Carter, hereby certify that I 3 was the Court Reporter at the STATE AIR POLLUTION 4 CONTROL BOARD MEETING regarding ATLANTIC COAST 5 PIPELINE, heard in Richmond, Virginia, on January 6 8th, 2019, at the time of the Board meeting herein. 7 I further certify that the foregoing 8 transcript is a true and accurate record of the 9 10 testimony and other incidents of the Board meeting herein. 11 12 Given under my hand this 19th of January, 13 2019. 14 15 16 17 Debroah Carter, CMRS, CCR Virginia Certified 18 Court Reporter 19 My certification expires June 30, 2019. 20 21 22 23 24 25